DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 699 CS 506 624

AUTHOR McKenzie, Paula; Ross, Susan
TITLE Working with Students from Diverse Cultural Backgrounds in Basic Courses in Speech Communication.
PUB DATE 4 May 89
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association (80th, Ocean City, MD, May 3-7, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cultural Awareness; Cultural Differences; Cultural Interrelationships; *Cultural Pluralism; Educational Research; Higher Education; *Intercultural Communication; Introductory Courses; Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS Cultural Sensitivity; *Speech Communication Education

ABSTRACT

Specific strategies need to be developed and implemented if teachers are to transmute cultural knowledge into cultural understanding in the classroom. The processes involved in developing successful pedagogy for basic speech courses with culturally diverse student populations must grow out of accurate information. A survey of recent literature reveals articles which focus on how basic communication courses are dealing with cultural pluralism, studying cultural differences in classroom behavior, and developing ways of learning more about cultural differences related to communication. For example, A. Wolfgang advocates training instructors to be more aware of the importance of nonverbal communication in the multicultural classroom. M. W. Hesler offers specific, research-based communication strategies for multicultural classes, and also uncovers culturally relevant differences in learning styles and goal structures. An examination of these and other studies and articles can contribute ideas which teachers can incorporate into the basic speech course. (Twenty-three notes and references are attached.) (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED305699

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Paula McKenzie
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

WORKING WITH STUDENTS FROM DIVERSE CULTURAL BACKGROUNDS IN BASIC COURSES IN SPEECH COMMUNICATION

Paula McKenzie

George Washington University

and

Susan Ross

Clarkson University

A paper presented at the ECA Basic Course Conference

Ocean City, Maryland, May 4, 1989

CS506624

Preface

According to Matluck (1978) "the monocultural classroom is....ceasing to exist" (p.12). However, cultural diversity does not guarantee cultural pluralism. Cultural pluralism has been defined as "mutual respect between individuals and between groups that differ in their lifestyle" (Nostrand, 1976).

Nostrand's definition, tellingly, has a 70's "ring" to it. When we decided to write this essay, we had expected to find and synthesize recent research, directly related to cultural pluralism in basic speech courses. However, although several studies were published in the 1960's and 1970's, a time when the needs of cultural minorities in the United States demanded acknowledgement, little has been published during this decade.[1]

One might conclude that activism and scholarship in the 1960's and 1970's solved the problems related to bringing cultural pluralism to basic speech classrooms. Indeed, many of us who were active in social justice movements during those decades hoped and believed such changes would occur. However, actions such as a hunger strike by minority students a New England university last spring are evidence that our dream has not become a perceived reality. More work is needed; we hope to contribute.

We are aware of the issue of superimposing "labels" on the cultural identities of others. However, in this paper, we have accepted the "labels" used by the respective authors of studies reviewed and have not attempted to develop uniform labels.

Introduction

Hesler (1987) observed that teacher education programs are including coursework in multi-cultural education and cultural-specific courses, such as Afro-American studies, but she argues that "merely studying some other culture does not guarantee that a teacher will be effective in teaching students from that culture."

We agree. Specific strategies need to be developed and implemented if teachers are to transmute cultural knowledge into cultural understanding in our classrooms. And the processes involved in developing successful pedagogy for basic courses with culturally diverse student populations must grow out of accurate information.

The scope of this paper does not allow a review of the content of courses in multi-cultural education or culture-specific studies. However, the quality of the content in those courses must be excellent to provide a basis for teaching excellence and our review of related literature suggests that there is much to learn about the cultural bases of differences in communicative behavior. However, some of our colleagues have begun to survey how basic communication courses are dealing with cultural pluralism, to study cultural differences in classroom behavior and to develop ways of learning more about cultural differences related to communication.

As teachers of a basic (public speaking) course at the public university in New England where we were colleagues until two years ago, we had few opportunties to interact with multiple cultures in the classroom. However, since moving to Washington, D.C. and upstate New York our classes have tended to have greater multicultural participation. In our new positions, the cultural mosaic in our classes

varys semester to semester. For example, in the fall and spring of 1987-88, approximately one third of the first author's students were from other countries (Asian, Arab, Hispanic, and African). And this year, the second author has students who identify themselves as: African-American, American, Black, Canadian, Caucasian, Chinese, Filipino, Finnish, Indian, Iranian, Mohawk, Native American Indian, Swedish, and White. A few add ethnic descriptions to a designation of White or American (e.g., Italian-American; American [My father was born in Hungary.]; American, our name is Polish). Still, about 80% of the students in the second author's single most "diverse" class identify themselves as White/Caucausian/American and just under 20% as Black, African-American, Canadian, Finnish, and Iranian.

After conducting literature searches in two academic libraries, we had discovered that few articles have been published about tailoring the basic course to fit the needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds. Therefore, after reviewing the few directly relevant articles we found, we broadened our search to include studies of differences in classroom behavior by students from specific cultural groups and effective instructional communication practices for working with those students. In particular, we focused on articles that described study methods which seemed promising for additional study on our topic.

A Review of Related Literature

Surveys of Cultural Diversity in the Basic Course

Our review uncovered only one article that focused on Non-Native speakers of English in the basic course (Shliessmann , 1985). The Fundamentals Speech Course director at a Midwestern state university noted an "influx" of students from 45 countries over a five year period. While the foreign students represented only 5% of the student body, the author perceived this to be a significant change. Therefore, that basic course director conducted a survey to study the needs and perceptions of foreign students enrolled in the course.

Shliessmann discovered a range of English training from six months to fifteen years. Regardless of their background in English, however, few of the foreign students "responded that they felt different or at a disadvantage because of their [level of] proficiency in [the English] language (p.11)."

A majority of the students surveyed rated interactions with other students as "good" (26%), "very good" (24%), and "excellent" (5%); and they reported that the class "encouraged interactions" (p.10). Some foreign students (11%) were dissatisfied with their interactions with classmates and their comments included observations about "racism and ignorance" [on the part of American students] (p.10).

The foreign students rated their interactions with their instructor higher than those with other students ("Fair" 17%, "good" 17%, "very good" 25%, and "excellent" 17%). Students who rated interaction with instructors positively commented upon the instructors' willingness to help and to create an atmosphere of mutual respect.

There were two models of the basic course at this university, a lecture/lab format used during the regular academic year and a "conventional" (single instructor) model used during the summer. The survey indicated that non-native speakers of English preferred the summer ("conventional") model "because it is more conducive to interpersonal relationships (p.10)."

Another article (Hesler, 1986) surveyed the ways American colleges and universities fulfill the oral communication needs of international students. Hesler found that what college and universities provide for "national students" they also provide for "international students". Most commonly, if a basic course is provided, that course is Public Speaking, students are required to present 3-5 speeches, and both national students and international students are enrolled in the same sections of the course. Hesler suggested further study to address the issue of whether or not foreign students are satisfied with the public speaking courses being offered them.

Understanding and Adapting to Culturally Diverse Student Populations

Wolfgang (1979) advocated training instructors to be more aware of the importance of nonverbal communication in the multicultural classroom. Training should encompass skill in using eye contact for showing and gaining attention, use of space, use of nonverbal reinforcement, use of facial expressions, body movements, use of hand movements, gestures for emphasis, use of touch, and the like. Presumably, this training would be based on a multi-cultural perspective that disclosed cultural differences in nonverbal codes.

Wagner (1981) focused on the enhancement of instructor/student relationships and student/student relationships. Five general suggestions are offered to instructors who wish to help culturally different students to be active, contributing members of their classes. First, instructors should be knowledgeable about culturally different students. This can be accomplished through reading, interviews, observations and visits with the students. Second, instructors should avoid stereotyping and accept student differences. Third, instructors should accept each student as an individual. Fourth, instructors should help students become secure as part of the group while retaining their cultural identities. Fifth, instructors should be "real" not "phony". Trust and confidence in the instructor can build a positive learning environment.

Jones (1985) encouraged teachers to develop an awareness of culture-specific differences and strategies for bridging potential intercultural gaps. Jones noted that " educational systems are...reflections of a culture's values, beliefs, attitudes, and hopes for future generations." Thus, education is a social process and "it is not only a product of culture but also one on many pathways of enculturation."

Hesler (1987) wrote an article offering specific, research-based communication strategies for multicultural classes. Hesler noted that students from various cultures and ethnic groups may have different styles of learning and communication styles asserted that teachers of multicultural classes must recognize individual and cultural differences. Teachers are urged, therefore, to learn about their

students' cultures, enabling themselves to answer the following questions:

1. How will the students in my class view the classroom?
2. What does their culture teach them about learning?
3. In what ways does their culture's view differ from [that of] my culture?

Hesler's own studies have uncovered culturally relevant differences in learning styles. Two styles discussed are an "analytical style" common to "Anglo and Jewish American" students and a "relational style" used by "Mexican, Alaskan, Hispanic, Black and Native American" students. The analytical style is described as follows: "....Language is an elaborate syntactic code. They learn by focusing on a stimulus and sustaining attention for long periods of time. They look for details and learning is viewed as impersonal" (p.4). In contrast, the relational style encourages learning "through language with a restricted syntactic code. They look for global characteristics and meaning is determined by the situation. Learning is from a personal view and self-orientation. They are people-oriented rather than object-oriented" (p.4).

As learning styles of students differ, so do the goal structures teachers encourage in their classes. Students' strategies for meeting learning goals in any given class are influenced (structured) by the extent to which students are expected to work independently or interdependently in that class. Hesler describes three kinds of goals structures: 1) cooperative or positive interdependence, 2) competitive or negative interdependence, and 3) individualistic or no interdependence. Students whose cultures encourage competition or

individualism may not adapt easily to group work (cooperative goal structures) which encourages students to work together to accomplish mutual goals. On the other hand, students from cultures that emphasize cooperation may be uncomfortable in courses in which collaboration is seen as cheating or in which grades are scaled to approximate a "normal" curve.

In sum, Hessler suggests that teachers first become aware of any differing assumptions students bring to our classrooms about what learning is and how it is accomplished. Then, if warranted, they should plan instruction that provides for pluralism in the class; for example allowing group projects for some students and individual learning contracts for others. Students also can be encouraged to use cultural resources such as family members, traditions, and possessions.

Ways of Acquiring Cultural Understanding

All but the first article reviewed in this section were written within the past ten years. One earlier article is included because of the potential usefulness of aspects of its methodology.

Dulay and Shultz (1972) studied communication breakdowns in classes of "Hispanic" students taught by "Anglo" teachers. They found that three major types of breakdowns occurred:

1. General breakdowns-- These can happen in any class and relate to teaching style and the classroom environment.
2. Language breakdowns-- These are based on inadequate understanding of English by the students or of Spanish by the teacher.
3. Cultural breakdowns-- These can occur when behaviors

mean different things in different cultures but when interactants from different cultural backgrounds assume the behaviors' meanings are universal.

Dulay and Shultz reviewed literature on communication in Hispanic cultures, focusing mainly on family communication. Then, they taped and transcribed classroom interactions, uncovered breakdowns of each of the types described above, and used their cultural knowledge to offer explanations of how and why each breakdown occurred.

Lujan, Kinnan, Hill, and Long (1979) studied communication classes of "Native American" ("Indian") students at a mid-western university with the stated goal of "maximizing the usefulness of classroom interactions for all persons involved" (p. 5). To this end, they did a participant-observation study not only in classrooms but also out-of-class settings ("pow-wows", out-of-class university activities).

They observed that Indian students' classroom communication was characterized by:

1. Complete withdrawal (being absent; dropping classes)
2. Non-participation in classroom discussion
3. Refusal ("polite") to respond to direct requests

For example, in a basic speech course, "Native American Public Address", students did research and developed detailed outlines for 4-6 minute speeches. However, in delivery, speeches were typically reduced in length by nearly one-half. Further, eye contact with the teacher or other students was avoided.

These behaviors were consistent with reticence and have

lead to the hypothesis that many Native American students are highly communication apprehensive. However, in out-of-class settings in which non-Indians were not significant participants, the same students were not reticent. Out-of-class reticence was observed only when non-Indians assumed dominant roles. Furthermore, the Indian students did not score higher than non-Indian counterparts (at the researchers' university) on McCroskey's (1977) Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA). However, their responses were far more uniform than those of non-Indian students.

From the observed behavior and the test results, the authors concluded that whatever the basis of behavior was, it was uniformly accepted. They speculated that non-participation in classrooms and other settings dominanted by non-Indians in a coping strategy by Indian students for whom participation in education is seen as a road to assimilation. "Education mediates Indianness" (p. 26).

The authors suggested that teachers confront and work to eliminate the illusion that non-participation is a successful coping strategy. They also warned that if students are adopting a strategy of non-participation to resist assimilation, a common strategy of non-Indian teachers, encouraging especially promising Indian students, may exacerbate the students' identity crises. Lastly, they observed that when classwork was done in small groups without direct teacher participation, Indian students manifested fewer behaviors associated with high CA.

Watson and Dodd (1984) did another study of cultural differences in communication apprehension (CA). Three groups of students were studied,

described as "American Blacks", "American Whites", and "Foreign" (mostly Middle Eastern and Latin American). Using the PRCA and Watson's (1979) Comparative Rating Scale of Communication Areas, they found no statistically significant differences between Black and White American Students. However, Foreign students differed from American students in two ways. First, they had less concern about interacting with authority figures and about speaking in public than did American students. The authors speculated that Foreign students may feel less pressure than either Black or White American students to make good impressions on authority figures or do well as public speakers.

Powell and Avila (1986) wondered if apparent differences in communicative competence between white and black students reflected ethnic bias in the measuring instrument the CCAI (Rubin, 1982) or actual differences in functional communication behavior in the classroom. They conducted a study that concluded that ethic bias was a factor in the inferior ratings received by black students. However Rubin (1986) argued that Powell and Avila's study was inconclusive because they did not ascertain that the subjects in their study were equivalent in all respects except for ethnic group.

In a very recently published study, M. Booth-Butterfield and Jordan (1989) took another approach to understanding differences in communication behavior of black and white college students. Those researchers studied communication adaptation among (previously acquainted) racially homogenous and heterogenous groups of college students (women). The groups in the study participated in videotaped

discussions of Killing us Softly, a 29 minute film about women's portrayal in advertising.

First, the researchers studied behavior in homogenous groups and found that black students in all-black groups were more nonverbally expressive and interrupted each other more than white women in all white groups. Blacks also exhibited somewhat more smiling and fewer adapters than whites. All groups adjusted their communication behavior in "racially-mixed" groups. But, contrary to the researchers' expectations, convergence (more smiling by whites; fewer interruptions by blacks) was more predominant than accomodation due to race.

Matluck (1978) studied crosscultural and linguistic factors that affect communication in classes with high percentages of Chinese, Filipino, and Hispanic students. The author notes that in classroom interaction, three sets of rules for communication are in operation: the school's, the teacher's, and the student's; each interacting with the other two. When different students may bring vastly different rules to the classroom, as in a "multi-ethnic" classroom, misunderstandings are especially likely to occur.

Matluck observes that understanding the rules brought into multi-ethnic classrooms is fundamental to maximizing learning and proposes that providing teachers with meaningful training in ethnographic techniques -- ways of gaining insight into another's culture-- will empower them to acquire the necessary cross-cultural understanding.

Through reading and ethnographic techniques, the authors learned, for example, cultural bases for why Filipino families might not attend a

conference requested by a teacher, but send a family friend instead and why Chinese students might appear shy (in their hesitation to volunteer to answer questions) in class discussion. In the former case, it was often assumed by teachers that the Filipino families "didn't care". However, the researchers discovered that within Filipino culture direct conflict is often avoided through indirect formulas, such as a "third party mediator." In the second case, teachers construed Chinese students to be shy when they were not among the early volunteers to answer teacher-posed questions. However, the researchers discovered the possiblitiy that students could be adopting a strategy of "leading from behind" as suggested by the philosopher Lao-tzu "that attaches more prestige to supplying correct response after others have erred" (p.10).

The final study we reviewed stands alone in its practical, pedagogical focus. Scollon (1981) presented a paper that reported action research to improve the teaching effectiveness of college instructors whose classes include culturally diverse student populations. More specifically, Scollon planned and implemented professional development seminars to help teachers, with pre-service and in-service training in cross-cultural education, apply their training to working effectively with "Alaska Native " students in their classes.

Scollon and students from the target group reviewed videotapes of the classroom teaching of participating teachers. The students provided feedback that disclosed some ways in which teaching behavior constructed barriers to learning: Use of problematic words ("talking down" or not defining unfamiliar terms), use of overly subtle cues to signal irony (intonation and nonverbal cues), a preference for starting with general

theory before dealing with specific cases (The students preferred just the opposite.), and insensitivity to cultural differences in rhythm (For, example, white urban students, who characteristically raised their hands most quickly in response to teachers questions were called upon and used up the amount of time allowed for student participation before Alaskan Native students who were slower to raise their hands had opportunities to contribute.).

Discussion: Two Perspectives

The First Author's Perspective

My review focused on classes that are culturally diverse in that they contain students who are not native speakers of English. With more non-native speakers on college campuses today, it is important for instructors to become more aware of the significance of cultural differences. Human interaction or process changes must accompany new content relevant to multicultural education. Content might reflect an awareness of cultural diversity in American society, examining both positive and negative aspects. A small group activity discussion allows students to share research and personal experiences of cultural diversity. This works very well as a beginning exercise in the basic course, combining a variety of suggested practices to achieve greater awareness of the diverse cultural community within the classroom.

Hunter (1971) recommended that process change might also include changing the questioning patterns of teachers and including imagination and thinking exercises for students. He noted that teaching must change in content structure and process simultaneously if change is to be effective. It seems to me that the purposes of basic speech courses [in

public speaking] include teaching students to analyze, think, and speak on their feet. To be able to apply the necessary tools to achieve a greater understanding of the world around them, students must draw on their creatvitiy to use their research about a topic or issue. Student talk can be increased by allowing students to work in pairs in order to discuss their strategies for the speeches to come. Students can be encouraged to share their personal views/ reactions in class discussions about topics in the news. It is important to keep students interested in what goes on in the world around them. Teachers do not have to judge their students' contributions to informal discussions, only listen. As students develop confidence in speaking out in class, that confidence may transfer to the times when they must give formal speeches in front of their classmates.

When students from different cultures are given an open forum in which to share their own personal views/reactions to "current events", classmates interact by sharing thoughtful responses and further questions about the cultural influences that have contributed to the students' stated positions. One of the papers we reviewed (Jones, 1985) suggested that structural changes within classrooms would allow for more direct discussion of cultural difference. Problem-solving skills developed in such an environment can also be applied to the community in which students live. Here in Washington, students have the opportunity to visit Capital Hill, participate in national events, and enter internships in which they are given the opportunity to test their problem-solving skills daily. Students can be encouraged to attend speakers on campus or any special event open to the public that

challenges them to analyze critically the content and delivery of speakers of the day.

Several of the studies we reviewed stressed the importance of differentiating instruction according to the learning styles associated with cultural backgrounds. Teachers of our basic courses should match their teaching styles with their students' learning styles. Children socialized in cultures which prioritize group achievement, cooperation, obedience, and deference to authority and persons over objects tend to be externally motivated, dependent on praise and reinforcement from significant others, and more readily responsive to humanistic and socially oriented curricula in learning settings. Cultures which emphasize individualism, assertiveness, personal initiative, and material well-being are likely to produce more analytical, competitive, impersonal, individualistic, and task-oriented students (Gay, 1981; Jones, 1985).

Whatever the student demographics in my classroom, I attempt to provide a warm, open classroom that encourages students to share their thoughts without fear of criticism. Discussion of current events in class seems to be a great vehicle for providing the opportunity for students to share their opinions. Ground rules such as "no judgemental comments may be offered on an opinion shared" seem to yield an atmospehere of trust. My students do speak out. Eventually every student in class speaks out on some issue. I understand that doesn't happen in all classes. That's what makes the basic course so special. It gives the student a chance to find her/his own voice and the confidence to speak

with it. It is important to enable all students to feel that safe and confident.

I'll never forget my female student from the United Arab Emirates. She chose a term topic for which she could have been imprisoned or killed in her country. She gave me a book about her country and told the class many stories about how women are treated so differently in her country. As she progressed through the basic course, she became more vocal in sharing her opinions and later told me, out of class, that she could not participate on this level in her country.

The opportunity to teach on a campus with such a diverse student population carries with it the responsibility of enabling all students to become the best they can be in whatever culture they participate in after leaving our campus. I do have a western focus, but I also work to achieve an open, warm atmosphere of acceptance that enables students to "test the waters" of the western university system steeped in analytical traditions.

A basic speech course is, many times, the only required university course in communication for foreign students. The majority of my students have found the course to be an asset. I believe that the awareness of individual differences and acceptance of those differences provide a necessary learning atmosphere. When encouraged to do their best, students often do just that--no matter where they come from.

<u>The Second Author's Perspective</u>

I view society in the United States today as culturally diverse. At any given time, our society includes people of a wide range of colors and nationalities, that possess cultural identities and are able to

articulate that identity in some human language. However, I doubt that our diversity is adequately reflected in the content of our educational curricula.

In late winter, while I was completing my reading for this paper, Dr. Na'im Akbar [2] told a predominantly black (African-American) audience at my university that they live in a diverse but not yet pluralistic society. He claimed that our educational institutions are shortchanging students by failing to provide detailed information about the history of human culture. He claimed that Black African- Americans aren't aware of their rich legacy from their ancesters because "nobody read the will."

He argued that students-- from every cultural background --educated in the United State are taught mostly about the Western civilization that had its roots in Western Europe, particularly in traditionally White Anglo-Saxon countries, and the ancient Greco-Roman civilization. Therefore, students from other cultural backgrounds feel excluded. He urged black students to "supply for yourselves what the insitution won't supply."

I left that lecture believing that it was my responsibility as an educator to add to my own knowledge of human culture so that I could attempt to guide all my students to self-understanding and self-appreciation. Hesler (1986) argued that it wasn't enough for teachers to learn about the students cultures; Akbar explained why. Our students may not understand their own cultural heritage nor acquire that cultural understanding without our assistance.

The literature we have reviewed has contributed some ideas that I can use, as a teacher in a basic public speaking course, to pursue the

goal of cultural pluralism. However, much more research needs to be done. And when more differences are understood, they need to be talked about.

To paraphrase an African proverb [3] recently shared with me, sub-cultures are simply different adaptations to different environments, none is better than another. However, according to Kochman (1981), it has been considered impolite in our society to discuss minority group differences in public. M. Booth-Butterfield and Jordan (1989) suggest that this social norm originated at a time when differences were assumed to be inferiorities and were discussed to justify discrimination. Now, not to discuss differences may perpetuate inequities.

As I mentioned earlier, our review of literature gave me several ideas that I can use to pursue the goal of cultural pluralism. First, I can use the insights on learning styles and goal structures (Heser,1986). I can be flexible about the processes students use to prepare speeches, allowing them to work indivdually or in small groups; encouraging research interviews as well as library research. I might even allow students to plan a program of speeches on related topics, if the "positive interdependence" that would require was more comfortable than a competitive or indivdualistic approach.

Second, I can apply specific findings on cultural differences in classroom communication behaviors to understanding some of my own students. For example, this semester, I have a Filipino student. After an early speech, that student expressed disappointment in the grade received. I noted that a "C" grade meant that the speech had adequately fulfilled the assignment, but that I'd be glad to have her come in

during office hours "to argue her case." After reading the description of the strategy of avoiding direct conflict that is characteristic of Filipinos (Matluck, 1978), I gained insight about why my student made but failed to keep an appointment to discuss her evaluation. Instead, she took my written suggestions very seriously and gave a significantly better speech during the next round.

Third, I can learn from the strategies that have been used to study cultural differences and their relevance to effective pedagogy. I am especially enthusiastic about the value of participant-observation studies and of videotaping for analysis and micro-teaching as demonstrated by researchers whose work we reviewed (e.g., M. Booth-Butterfield and Jordan, 1989; Dulay and Shultz, 1972; Lujan, Kinnan, Hill and Long, 1979; Scollon, 1981).

Fourth, I can appreciate and pass along the a point made by Hesler (1986):

> As western trained teachers, we tend to believe that the more students interact with those who are culturally different, the more skilled they become in interacting with others different from themselves. Let us make that thought reality by becoming effective in the classroom (p.10).

Notes

1. Based on searches of Index to Journals in Communication Studies through 1985. R.J. Matlon (Ed.), Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association and ERIC database (Silver Platter, CD/ROM).

2. N. Akbar. "The Challenge of Black Students at White Universities." A lecture given at Clarkson University, February 27, 1989.

3. J. Tolliver. In classwork for my course, Mass Media in Society.

Bibliography/References

Booth-Butterfield, M. and Jordan, F. (1989). Communication adaptation among racially homogenous and hetergeneous groups. Southern Communication Journal,54, 253-272.

Dulay, H. and Shultz, J. (1972). Crosscultural miscommunication in the classroom. Paper presented at the joint annual meeting of the Society for Applied Anthropology and the American Ethnological Society, Montreal, Canada.

Gay, G. (1981). Interactions in culturally pluralistic classrooms. In J.A. Banks (Ed.), Education in the 80's: Multiethnic Education, 42-53, Washington D.C.: National Education Association.

Hesler, M.W. (1986). A survey of the ways American colleges and universities meet the oral communication needs of international students. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association of Puerto Rico, San Juan.

Hesler, M.W. (1987). Communication strategies for the multicultural class. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association of Puerto Rico, San Juan.

Hunter, E. (1971). Encounter in the Classroom: New ways of teaching. New York: Holt.

Jones, C.M. (1985). Practical applications of multicultural communication theory in the classroom setting. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Communication Association, Fresco, CA.

Lujan, P; Kinnan, L.; Hill, B.; and Long, L. (1979). Communication reticence of native americans in the classroom: A reconceptualization and approach. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, San Antonio, TX.

McCroskey, J.C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. Human Communication Research,4, 78-96.

Matluck, J.H. (1978). Cultural norms and classroom discourse: Communcation problems in the multiethnic school setting. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Canada.

Nostrand, H.L. (1976). Cultural Pluralism: What for? By what Means? At what cost? Montana Association of Language Teachers [Journal], 21, 4-12.

Porter, R.E. (1972). An overview of intercultural communication. In L.A. Samovar and R.E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural Communication: A reader, 3-18. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Powell, R.G.and Avila, D.R. (1986). Ethnicity, communication competency and classroom success: A question of assessment. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 50, 269-278.

Rubin, R.B. (1982) Assessing speaking and listening competence at the college level: The Communication Competency Assessment Instrument. Communication Education, 31, 9-18.

Rubin, R.B. (1986) A response to "Ethnicity, communication competency and classroom success", Western Journal of Speech Communication, 50, 279-282.

Schliessmann, M.R. (1985). Non-native speakers of English in the basic speech course. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Denver, CO.

Scollon, S.B.K. (1981). Professional Development Seminar: A model for making higher educatinal more culturally sensitive. A paper presented at the conference of the National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education, Honolulu, HI.

Wagner, H. (1981). Working with the cultrually different student. Education, 101, 353-358.

Watson, A.K. and Dodd, C.H. (1984). The effects of communication apprehension and cultural differences on selected communication behaviors. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Wolfgang, A. (1979). The teacher and nonverbal behavior in the multicultural classroom. In Wolfgang (Ed.), Nonverbal behavior: Applications and cultural implications. N.Y.: Academic.